

NIL, Y. et al.

Appl. No. 10/006,246

Response to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to as allegedly failing to show the relay section of claim 19. While not acquiescing in this objection, the relay section feature of claim 19 has been deleted and thus this objection is moot.

The disclosure was objected to because "supplemental error testing means" is allegedly incomprehensible. The subject patent application does not claim such a feature and the text of this objection is believed to be a typographical error.

Claim 18 was objected to because "information display terminal" allegedly lacks antecedent basis in the specification. While not acquiescing in this objection, claim 18 has been amended to recite "information communication terminal." This language was present in original claim 18 and support in the specification for this term is provided at page 41, lines 9-10, for example.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, because the specification is allegedly not enabling for the "outputting section" recited therein. While not agreeing with this rejection, claim 24 has been amended to recite an inputting section for inputting a third using condition to use a vehicle. By way of example and without limitation, this feature finds support in input section 81 shown in Figure 15 and the corresponding description on pages 56 and 57.

Claims 19 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, because the specification is allegedly not enabling for the relay section respectively recited therein. Claim 28 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and thus the rejection with respect to this claim is moot. With respect to claim 19, the relay section feature has been deleted and the features of claim 27 incorporated therein.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the third reading section, the second reading section, the first reading section, the checking section and the recording

NII, Y. et al.  
Appl. No. 10/006,246  
Response to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

section are part of the information recording medium issuing apparatus. Similarly, claim 24 has been amended to clarify that the inputting section, the second reading section, the checking section, the first reading section and the recording section are part of the information recording medium issuing apparatus. Page 54 of the specification provides support for these amendments.

Claims 19 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. As noted above, claim 28 has been canceled and thus the rejection with respect to this claim is moot. The above-described amendments to claim 19 are believed to address the indefiniteness issues raised with respect to this claim.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 10, 11, 13, 16-20, 23-25 and 28-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed combination of Sehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,658) and Obradovich (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,231).

Sehr discloses a passenger card that stores an electronic ticket. The card is described in col. 6 of Sehr as "[displaying] data relating to tickets, passengers and system entities." Sehr however does not disclose or suggest the concept of using the passenger card to access information services provided by an information server in a vehicle. The office action acknowledges this deficiency (see 12/13/2008 Office Action, page 9) and relies on Obradovich et al. to supply the missing features. In particular, the office action refers to the master interface of Obradovich et al. and contends that it would have been obvious to combine "Obradovich's ideas of visualable (sic) interfacing between vehicle and passenger" in Sehr's system.

Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits that Obradovich teaches away from the subject matter of independent claims 1, 2, 10, 13, 16-19 and 31-33. In particular, Obradovich discloses a master interface to manage system functions in a vehicle. This interface may include a display 205 located on a dashboard of the automobile. Consequently, to the extent information is provided, it is displayed on a display that is common for all passengers. This is quite different from the concepts described in claims 1, 2, 10, 13, 16-19 and 31-33 in which information is provided to a portable display device possessed by an individual passenger of a public transport vehicle. In the context of a public transport vehicle as described in the subject patent application with reference to example embodiments, different passengers can access different information services based on individual preferences or needs. No such concept is present in either of the applied references. Specifically, Sehr does not contemplate providing information services to

NII, Y. et al.  
Appl. No. 10/006,246  
Response to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

passengers on a public transport vehicle and, at best, Obradovich suggests that information may be displayed on a common display of a master interface to all passengers. There is no way absent impermissible hindsight to fairly combine these references so as to result in the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 10, 13, 16-19 and 31-33 or any claims that depend therefrom.

Independent claims 23 and 24 are each directed to an information recording medium issuing apparatus. Both Sehr and Obradovich are silent about issuing an information recording medium. Although the office action asserts that the combination of these references would result in the claimed apparatus, there is no identification in the office action of which of the references discloses an information recording medium issuing apparatus. Consequently, the office action fails to even set forth a prima facie basis for the rejection of these claims.

Moreover, the office action acknowledges that Sehr does not disclose the first reading section or the recording section of claims 23 and 24. See 12/13/2008 Office Action, pages 15 and 17. The office action refers to the master interface of Obradovich as providing these missing features. However, the master interface of Obradovich does not involve issuing a recording medium and in no way whatsoever discloses features that remedy the deficiencies of Sehr in this regard.

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by the proposed Sehr-Obradovich combination, further in view of Flick (U.S. Patent No. 6,140,939). Flick does not remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Obradovich with respect to a passenger accessing information services on a vehicle using a portable display device as set forth in claim 12. Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 12 and its dependent claim 14 patentably distinguish from the proposed combination of Sehr, Obradovich and Flick.

Claims 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made obvious by the proposed Sehr-Obradovich combination, further in view of Issa (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,936). Issa does not remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Obradovich with respect to a passenger accessing information services on a vehicle using a portable display device as set forth in claims 34 and 35. Consequently, for at least this reason, claims 34 and 35 patentably distinguish from the proposed combination of Sehr, Obradovich and Issa.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by the proposed Sehr-Obradovich combination, further in view of Cohen (U.S. Patent No.

NII, Y. et al.

Appl. No. 10/006,246

Response to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

6,060,993). Cohen does not remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Obradovich with respect to a passenger accessing information services on a vehicle using a portable display device as set forth in claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 6 patentably distinguishes from the proposed combination of Sehr, Obradovich and Cohen.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by the proposed Sehr-Obradovich combination, further in view of Joao (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,130). Joao does not remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Obradovich with respect to a passenger accessing information services on a vehicle using a portable display device as set forth in claim 19, from which claim 27 depends. Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 19 patentably distinguishes from the proposed combination of Sehr, Obradovich and Joao.

Claims 21, 22 and 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by the proposed Sehr-Obradovich combination, further in view of Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,874). Murphy does not remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Obradovich with respect to a passenger accessing information services on a vehicle using a portable display device as set forth in claim 18, from which claims 21, 22 and 26 each depends. Consequently, for at least this reason, claims 21, 22 and 26 patentably distinguish from the proposed combination of Sehr, Obradovich and Murphy.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100